

From: chip@the-altmans.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/28/02 11:07am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the remedy is fair and should end the case completely. I do not feel that Microsoft has hurt the public in any matter. Ten to fifteen years ago the computer industry was in a mess. There was no standard operating system. If you went to purchase a computer at Radio Shack you would get a computer running Deskmate. If you went to an Apple distributor you got the Apple operating system. If you went to IBM you got their OS operating system. And then of course you had Windows. Kids in school learned Apple but could not go into businesses and run their computers. The average person had to have an apple computer so their kids could do homework and an IBM computer so they could work at home. Since then and thanks to Microsoft the industry has been standardized, kids in school can go out in the world and run computers. Employees can go home and work on a computer with the same system they use at work. By becoming standardized, how does this hurt consumers?

Microsoft has saved the average consumer thousands of dollars. By their continued innovation and development of the operating system they have added tools and recourses that would have cost the average consumer a lot of money. If Microsoft charged for each addition to its product, or forced the consumer to purchase such things as Internet explorer, word, notepad, a calculator, Paint, the basic TCP/IP protocols, the average person could not afford these add ons and would be shut out of the internet.

As for Internet Explorer, that was the best thing that Microsoft ever did. It made surfing the web enjoyable. Question, did you ever try to use Netscape Navigator before Internet Explorer came along, I have and it sucked. You had to pay around \$50.00 for it, it took several hours to down load and would crash so often that trying to look up one item would take hours. Microsoft came and gave you Internet Explorer, which at first had its problems, but when they finally integrated into the operating system, it was fantastic, you could surf the net and really enjoy the experience. System hangs and lockups that occurred often before integrating disappeared. And by integrating the software it saved me money, how DID this hurt me? I know the argument it hurt competition, my argument is it did not hurt competition, it caused competition. It caused Netscape to wake up and make a better product. At a more reasonable price, this let the consumer save money by being able to buy a!

better product at a lower cost. Microsoft did nothing wrong. Those consumers that wanted Netscape still continue to use it, if Netscape wanted to keep customers, and gain customers, they should have developed a product that knocked the socks out of Internet Explorer, but did they no, they cried and sued. They gave up, because they would not take the time and resources to develop a better product. I, know, the argument how could they when they did not have the money because Microsoft was giving the product away, simple, build it and they will come. The consumer wants better products and if the consumer found an item better those that can afford will buy it.

Is it wrong, to build your business, and to protect your business. NO, it is not wrong! Microsoft played hard ball, yes, but how is that different from any other company that wants to grow, expand, and make a difference. Netscape, AOL, Sun Microsystems and others are playing hard ball now, buy suing Microsoft, because of their jealousy over the dominance Microsoft has. If the companies really cared about the consumer, they would build better products that would blow Microsoft way. But do they no, the run and scream and sue Microsoft, because Microsoft does not play fair. If these companies would build better products on the same caliber as Microsoft, consumers will go there; they will buy what they want. But stripping down Windows will only hurt the consumer, because the costs associated with buying each piece of software will be more than the average consumer can afford. But those that can afford the software will buy the better software. How is this any different !

from the auto industry? Yes, I know that there are several companies competing equally, If I went to ford

to buy car should they be required to give me a stripped down car. So that I can go to Chrysler to purchase the motor, to Bose for the stereo, to Goodyear for the tires, to Monroe Muffler for the Shocks, and Muffler. NO, they provide the basic systems and then you buy the additional or custom items that you want. Microsoft does that they provide the consumer with the basics and let the consumer buy what they want. The problem is the other companies are not making products that are better and more desirable. End the lawsuit now and let Microsoft go back and build and innovate so that the envelope of information and knowledge becomes more reliable and available to the average consumer, and so that these other companies will be forced to push the envelope even further buy building better software. If these companies would just worry about building better software that pushes the limits, they would not have to worry about Microsoft.
